# A Remarkable Manifestation of "Liberal Catholicism."

Few works published by Catholic writers during the last years, have aroused such interest and have met with such criticism as the book of Rev. Dr. Albert Ehrhard, Professor of Church History at the University of Vienna, on 'The Catholic Church and the Twentieth Century.'

The Review has waited with its report until the authoritative Catholic critics of Germany have had their say with regard to the ideas proposed by Dr. Ehrhard. Almost all journals of repute have now passed their judgment. We have followed with great interest the criticisms of the most important of them, as the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, the *Theologische Revue*, the *Historisch-politische Blätter*, and the *Linzer Quartalschrift*. Much has been justly said in praise of Dr. Ehrhard, of his great ability, his brilliant style, his good intentions and love of the Church. But the greater part of the critics of authority have made so many reservations that our original impression is confirmed, that the book as a whole is to be rejected as harmful.

Shortly after the publication of the first edition, the distinguished Redemptorist Father Rösler, of Vienna, characterized the book as "the most subtle and the ablest work which Liberal Catholicism has produced in the German language since its defeat at the Vatican Council." Although the articles of Father Rösler met with great opposition, even from Catholics, yet most of the abler Catholic critics have come to the same conclusion. One of the latest and best criticisms on the subject is that of Father Michael Hofmann, S. J., in the Innsbruck *Quartalschrift*. We give the outlines of his argument:

The aim of Prof. Ehrhard is to pave the way for the reconciliation of the modern world with Catholicism, for the reconquest of the modern spirit by the Church, and for the salvation of modern society. Truly a high and noble task, worthy of an Apostolic heart. To accomplish it, Catholics as well as their adversaries must do their share. Catholics must, according to Ehrhard, accommodate themselves to the representatives of modern civilization as much as possible, in other words, reduce their demands upon modern society to what is absolutely essential, and do away

(The Review, Vol. IX, No. 33. St. Louis, Mo., August 28, 1902.)

with everything that is of only relative importance. Now, what is absolutely necessary? The author says: "As the Middle Ages (the same logically holds good of every other epoch) have no absolute value in any branch of ecclesiastical activity, except in the consequent development of dogma, none of their other achievements (except the dogmas) need be regarded as binding for the present time." (352.)

Therefore, dogmas alone, according to Ehrhard, have absolute value, whence it follows logically, that all truths and institutions in the Church, which are not defined as dogmas or are not essential to the Church, can be ignored, especially if they are apt to prevent a reconciliation with the modern world. Ehrhard hints at this repeatedly: "For the Catholic, the declaration of papal infallibility has had a liberating influence, restricting considerably the limits within which the activity of the Pope as head of the Catholic Church embodies absolute truth. For in and together with this it is declared that his activity outside of these limits does not claim for itself divine truth and sanctity." (265, 266). Prof. Ehrhard emphasizes very strongly that "our adversaries like to obliterate the essential difference between historical and temporary endeavors and personal views on the one hand, and on the other the absolutely valid norms and dogmas in the Catholic Church. As against this procedure we must with all energy insist that for the essential estimation of the Catholic Church only the dogmatic principles are of importance;"..... only dogmatic principles have "absolute value," all the rest has "but a relative significance."

Is this view of Ehrhard correct? By no means. The author overlooks an important point. The Council of the Vatican has indeed defined that the Pope has under certain conditions the same infallibility as the universal Church; but it in no way intended to limit the range of Catholic doctrinal authority to revealed truths proper. It rather insists that Catholics are bound to give their assent also to decisions of the Church concerning matters appertaining to or affecting revelation, though those matters be not found, strictly speaking, within the deposit of faith. (Sess. iii., c. 4.) The declaration of infallibility, therefore, has not had a "liberating" influence.

Already Pius IX. in his famous encyclical *Quanta cura*, of the 8th of December, 1864, declared in the most solemn manner to the whole Catholic world: "We can not pass over in silence the insolence and arrogance of those who, impatient of sound doctrine, affirm that one may without sin and without infringing in the least upon one's Catholic faith, refuse assent and obedience to the judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See....., as long as

they do not encroach upon the dogmas of faith and morals. How much this doctrine is against the Catholic dogma of the plenitude of power.... given to the Roman Pontiff by our Lord Jesus Christ, every one will readily understand."

In the Syllabus, which, together with the encyclical quoted above, was sent to all the bishops of the world, the Vicar of Christ condemned the following sentence:

"The obligation which strictly binds Catholic teachers, professors, and writers, is limited only to those things that by infallible judgment are proposed as dogmas of faith; these alone must be held by all as true."

Leo XIII., quite in harmony with his predecessor, says: "In determining how far the limits of obedience extend, let no one imagine that the authority of the sacred pastors, and above all of the Roman Pontiff, need be obeyed only in as far as it is concerned with dogmas, the obstinate denial of which entails the guilt of heresy. It is not enough even to give a frank and firm assent to doctrines which are put forward in the ordinary and universal teaching of the Church as divinely revealed, although they have never been solemnly defined. Christian men have a further duty, —they must be willing to be ruled and governed by the authority and direction of their bishops, and, in the first place, of the Apostolic See." (*Sapientiae Christianae*, January 10th, 1890.)

The bishops of the province of Westminster, in their famous pastoral of December 29th, 1900, brand as characteristic of a Liberal Catholic that spirit "which strips itself of all instincts of faith and religious obedience, till scarcely any sentiment survives beyond the desire to avoid actual heresy."

That Prof. Ehrhard, with his proposed means of reconciliation —the limitation of doctrinal authority to strict dogma,—has switched into the track of so-called Liberal Catholicism, is proved by his view of the Syllabus (256): "The Syllabus does not at all possess the character of a dogmatical decision; it is only of historical and temporary importance;" and he characterizes it as "an act of self-defense on the part of ecclesiastical authority against the excessive attacks, upon the Catholic Church, of nineteenth century Liberalism. As the attack, so the defense was determined by the time and had the nature of a polemic dart."

Doubtless in this view the importance of the Syllabus is underestimated. Pius IX., in his encyclical *Quanta cura*, which introduces the Syllabus, voices very different sentiments: "In the midst of such perversity of opinion, we, mindful of our Apostolic duty and solicitous for our holy religion, for sound doctrine and the welfare of the souls entrusted to our care, and at the same time for the true welfare of human society, raise our Apostolic

voice and condemn, reject, and anathematize, in virtue of our Apostolic authority, all doctrines, singly and collectively, which are enumerated in this writing; and it is our will and command that all children of the Catholic Church likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize them."

Professor Schrörs, of Bonn, therefore, correctly says: "Ehrhard is too quickly done with the Syllabus. To deny to it absolutely the character of a dogmatical decision, and to attribute to it only an essentially historic and temporary importance, will not do." (*Theologische Revue*, 1902, No. 2, p. 62.)

If Dr. Ehrhard says that Leo XIII. himself has modified the Syllabus, let him but remember the words of this Pontiff in his encyclical *Immortale Dei* of the 1st of November, 1885: "Pius IX. has branded several of the errors most widely spread, and put them together, so that Catholics may have a guide through this flood of errors."

Considering the above-mentioned views of Ehrhard on the Syllabus, it is not surprising to hear him assert: "What holds good of the Pope, (that, excepting dogmatical decisions, all his activity has only a historical and personal character,) is even more true regarding the Roman prelates and congregations, and all the rest of the ecclesiastical authorities." (266.)

The bishops of the province of Westminster, on the other hand, enumerate among the false theories "advanced in the name of science, criticism, and modern progress," also the following: "That the Church's teaching should be limited to the articles or definitions of Catholic faith; that it is permissible to reject her other decisions,.....her authority and especially that of the Roman congregations."

But the book of Ehrhard bears other earmarks of so-called Liberal Catholicism. It rehashes, though with more moderation, the views and lamentations of Liberalism about the Middle Ages, especially against Scholasticism and the Inquisition, against the Index, against antiquated theology, against the Jesuits, the Syllabus, against Pius IX, etc., etc. Besides, we have here an overrating of modern civilization, especially of the results of science, of modern religious inwardness and similar things, of the daily pabulum offered by liberal newspapers and romances. The author does not shed a tear over the loss of the Papal States. Neither does he seem to fancy certain devotions and customs practised in the Church to-day. The powerful development of the papal central power since the middle of the XIX. century scarcely pleases him. "A more general summoning of laymen to ecclesiastical affairs and the extension of their rights, as being more in correspondence

with Church government," is brought forth as a requirement of the present time.

Some of those opinions are quite literally, almost all of them are implicitly, among the errors rejected by the bishops of the Province of Westminster in their pastoral on the Church and Liberal Catholicism. The theories that "the government of the Church should be largely shared by the laity, as a right," that "the more learned among the laity should rank as teachers and masters in Israel," that "it is permissible to criticize the devotions of the Church," are declared by this pastoral, so highly praised by the Sovereign Pontiff, as "errors which are attacks, more or less thinly veiled, upon the rights and liberties of the Church, which are to be met with among ill-instructed and Liberal Catholics."

Considering all this, we believe ourselves justified in declaring the work of Ehrhard a partisan pamphlet of Liberal Catholicism. Although we gladly acknowledge the good features of the book, and especially the good will of its author, we deplore its publication. "It is from seeds such as these (Liberal Catholicism)," in the words of the bishops of the province of Westminster, "that schisms and heresies arise, take shape and form. It is from the spread of such opinions by persons who have won a position in literature or in science, that the faithful begin to lose their holy dread of erroneous doctrines and false principles. Thus faith becomes tainted, moral virtue relaxed, and, in process of time, liberalism in religion invades the whole mind, until, like their leader, many of the faithful are thought to be alive, and they are dead."

He who reads the grand encyclicals of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. will find that those saintly men, from the eminence of the rock of Peter, have much better than any one else fathomed the world and the sufferings of modern society, the true and the false in modern civilization. Not until the modern world resolves to follow their inspired teachings, will the salvation of twentieth century humanity be assured.

# The Knights of Columbus From a Financial Point of View.

COMPARISON of the returns made by the Knights of Columbus to the State insurance departments of New York and Massachusetts, as published in the official reports for 1901, shows such remarkable discrepancies that an explanation by the proper officers seems to be in order.

As evidence we here quote the figures for income and expenditures in parallel columns:

| INCOME FOR 1901. | NEW YORK. | MASS. |
|---|---|---|
| Annual dues, per capita tax, etc | $ 56.297.90 | $ 56,297.90 |
| Assessments | 348,176.38 | 345,176.38 |
| Medical examiners' fees | 2,090.50 | 2,090.50 |
| Interest | 20,287.96 | 20,287.96 |
| Sale of supplies | 3,697.45 | 3,697.45 |
| Received from all other sources | 1,247.03 | 247.03 |
| Total | $431,797.22 | $427,797.22 |
| DISBURSEMENTS DURING 1901. | | |
| Salaries and claims | $234,000.00 | $234,000.00 |
| Salaries of managers and agents | 14,292.02 | 14,292.02 |
| Salaries and other compensation of officers | 13,243,37 | 13,243.37 |
| Salaries and other compensation of office employés | 4,023.53 | 4,023.53 |
| Medical examiners' fees | 2,402.00 | 2,402.00 |
| Rent 883.75, adv. and printing 3,531 | 4,414.86 | 4,414.86 |
| Legal expenses | 2,009.55 | 2,009.55 |
| Governing bodies | 20,287.87 | 20,287.87 |
| Payment on mortgage | 3,000.00 | |
| Supplies | 6,113.91 | 6,113.91 |
| All other items (for New York) | 4,630.10 | |
| All other items (for Massachusetts as follows: Postage, express, and telegraph, $2,697.07; Insurance departments $435; Incidentals $498.03; total, | | 3,630.10 |
| Expenses and management, | $74,417.21 | $70,417.21 |

The income account in New York shows $3,000 more under "assessments" and $1,000 more under "from other sources," making a difference of $4,000. These $4,000 figure in the New York report as "payment of a mortgage" $3,000, and "all other items"

$1,000, not shown in Massachusetts report, so that the New York report gives $4,000 more to expense account than Massachusetts does.

That is certainly remarkable bookkeeping, and before commenting on such showing, explanations are invited.

# Secret Catholic Societies.

THE Wichita *Catholic Advance*, in its edition of July 17th, had an editorial under the heading of "Secret Catholic Societies" that greatly resembled in style the famous prospectus of the Albertus Magnus College of Wichita, Kans.

The author starts with the words: "All heresies go in pairs." In proof he adduces: Arianism and Sabellianism, Nestorianism and Monophysitism, Pelagianism and Ultra-Predestrianirianism (whatever that may be), Caesarism and Lollardism and Waldensianism (this is a trio), Worldliness and Quietism, Bibliolatry and Anti-Biblicism, Rationalism and Traditionalism, Scepticism and Ontologism, Laxity and Rigorism. There is a grain of truth in putting these together, sufficient to startle the fellow-citizens of Carrie Nation and Mrs. Lease, the good-natured farmers of Sedgwick County, Kans.; but not enough to convince an educated reader of the analogy built up thereon, to-wit:

"Thus it is with the secret society question. Among those Catholics who are most bitter in their hostility to the Free Masons and the related societies equally condemned by the Church, there are many who, from an imperfect understanding of the grounds of their condemnation, (i. e., sectarianism, the blind oath, and in some countries virulent hostility to religion), denounce all secret societies as such, and consider the possession of grips, passwords, rituals and similar features a just ground for suspicion, even in the case of bodies, otherwise, of the most Catholic character."

Here we have at least two assertions that are absolutely and entirely gratuitous, viz., that many Catholics condemn all secret societies as such, and that some of the societies thus condemned have a "most Catholic character." There is secrecy and secrecy. Every family has its secrets which it guards from profane eyes; so have the State and Church. The old guilds had their secrets, which they jealously kept from outsiders, but not from the Church or the State; on the contrary, they submitted their rules

and by-laws to the approval of both. Do those societies, "otherwise of the most Catholic character," do so?

"All that is necessary to make a secret society thoroughly acceptable from a Catholic point of view," continues the writer, "even to the most exacting mind, s that it shall be composed exclusively of practical Catholics, and that its rituals and secrets shall be known and approved by the ordinary of the diocese in which it is found. Practically, the approbation of any bishop and the toleration of the local ordinaries are sufficient to exonerate any professedly Catholic society from a suspicion resting upon no more legitimate grounds than its possession of secrets and a ritual."

To which we would say, in the first place,—No so-called secret Catholic society has obliged itself to receive as members only practical Catholics. Next, the only so-called secret Catholic society of which we have particular knowledge, the Knights of Columbus, has not only not obtained the approval of the local ordinary in at least one case, but started branches in a diocese where the ordinary positively refused his approbation. Does that show practical Catholicity or a "most Catholic character"?

We should like to hear the answer of the *Catholic Advance* to these questions.

# CONTEMPORARY CHRONICLE.

## THE RELIGIOUS WORLD.

***The Church in Holland.***—An American priest of Dutch extraction writes to THE REVIEW:

The *Ave Maria* says: "If Holland with a Catholic population of only 1,700,000, can maintain several Catholic dailies, surely this country ought to be able to maintain one. If not, then it is perfectly plain that the calibre of Dutch and American Catholics is somewhat different."

There is indeed a vast difference between the calibre of Dutch and American Catholics. In Holland one finds hardly a Catholic family that does not subscribe to one or more Catholic papers; in our country (at least in many parishes) it is hard to find a Catholic who reads a Catholic paper at all, even at his neighbor's expense.

"The conditions in both countries are much the same," says the *Ave Maria*. True, both countries have a Protestant majority and a Catholic minority. But this is about all the analogy we can discover.

Our government in many respects is fair towards the Church; but it can hardly stand a comparison with Holland.

The Catholic schools in the Netherlands receive almost as much from the State treasury as the public schools.

The Dutch school law says: "It is the duty of the teacher to instill into the minds of his pupils Christian and social virtues." Any religion can be taught in the public schools, provided no one's religious feelings are hurt. This provision, of course, makes religious instruction practically impossible, except in the two southern provinces, Noord-Brabant and Limburg, which are almost exclusively Catholic. In those two provinces many public schools are real Catholic schools. A crucifix hangs on the wall, prayers are said before and after class, catechism and bible history are taught, etc.; yet the teachers receive their entire salary from the government. They get nothing from the parents, except some presents, once in a while. The grateful Dutch Catholics respect a pious, competent teacher almost as highly as a priest.

* * *

In my last correspondence I wrote "several prominent Catholics receive communion every week." May I quote some striking examples?

The district in which I am born is represented in the second chamber by a Catholic. When I was a student, I used to spend part of my vacation in the town where he lived. Every Sunday I saw this prominent statesman (he is still one of the leading members of the Dutch Parliament) approaching the Holy Table. And very rarely did he miss vespers in the afternoon.

It is about six years ago that Mr. Bahlman, another Catholic representative, dropped dead in parliament while speaking in defence of the Catholic party. His death was sudden and unexpected, but he was fully prepared to meet the Supreme Judge, for that same day he had received Him in holy communion. It was on a first Friday.

Indeed the calibre of Dutch and American Catholics is somewhat different.

* * *

In a note on "The Church in Holland" the *Ave Maria* remarks: "A notable feature of Catholicity in Holland is the perfect understanding and harmonious coöperation of the regular and secular clergy." It is this harmonious coöperation which makes the Church in Holland so strong. The average secular priest perfectly understands what the religious life means in the Church.

The perfect understanding also between the Christian parties (since the compulsory school law and compulsory military law have become facts) is an immense blessing for the country. If this union did not obtain, Liberals, Radicals, and Socialists would form the majority.

Controversies between Catholics and Protestants are, with rare exceptions, carried on in a spirit of charity.

The mixing with Protestants is a small danger to Holland Catholics, because they are well instructed in their religion. The children have to attend catechism for three full years after making their first communion. Besides, catechetical instructions are

given on Sundays at low mass, while the Gospel is explained at high mass.

Many societies, although under Catholic supervision, are not specifically Catholic. The Catholics however hold their own meetings and "Katholiekendagen."

I fully agree with the *Ave Maria* when it says: "The promising outlook for the Church in Holland and other European countries is a gratifying offset to the disasters with which she is menaced in France:"

## POLITICS AND SOCIOLOGY.

***The Public Printing-Office and Government Ownership.***—The United States government has built a printing-office, at a cost of several million dollars, having seven acres of floor space, which it gives rent free to the Public Printer. It furnishes him the capital and credit of the government with which to do business. It exempts all his stock in trade, machinery, and equipment from local taxation. And yet, according to the Washington correspondent of the N. Y. *Evening Post* (July 30th), private concerns, borrowing money from the banks to get along, and paying taxes, and hiring buildings, can underbid him always by 20 per cent. The Comptroller's opinion was that the Secretary of the Treasury, or any other cabinet officer, could not have his printing done anywhere else than by the Public Printer. This was the decision of Congress regarding the Census Office, and it doubtless cost the taxpayers not far from a million dollars.

In these days of agitation in behalf of government ownership of railroads, telegraphs, etc., of government building of war-ships in the navy-yards, of extensions of the postal service through parcels posts and postal banks, should not the advocates of these various steps rise to explain why the government conducts such business as it now does at a tremendous loss? They should also explain what advantage it is to the every-day taxpayer, who in his consumption of sugar, beer, tobacco, and distilled spirits, largely supports the federal government, to pay twice as much for things made by the government as for those which he can buy outside. And yet the special champions of the common people in Congress are always on the side of the government work. The government Printing-Office is a subject of frequent laudation in congressional debate. It is eulogized as the greatest printing-office in the world, when in reality it is a monument to the retrogression of the printers' art, under the lethargic influence of politics and patronage, including in these the necessary submission to trade-unionism. The government manager, under the implied threats of the labor unions, is seeking methods of avoiding, or at least delaying and postponing, economical methods. And yet many citizens think the government should run all or nearly all public enterprises. Perhaps it should, but the advocates of this innovation must not draw their arguments from such experiences as are already of record.

***Catholic Journeymen's Unions in the Archdiocese of Cologne.***—From the last annual report (April 1891-1902) we learn that the Kolping institutes, despite the many other benevolent institutions in the

Archdiocese of Cologne, Germany, are still on the increase. They number 72, two more than the year previous, with an active membership of 10,000. Besides these active members, as many honorary members belong to them. The attention paid to the moral and religious education of the members is particularly worthy of praise. The reports of the several branch unions unanimously laud the good attendance at the religious lectures (mostly apologetic, without any violent polemics). As attacks on the Catholic faith are very common in factories and workshops, nothing can be of greater value for the preservation and spread of religion than such instructions. The quarterly general communions of the journeymen were also well attended.

52 unions have regular technical and commercial courses, attended by 4,000 journeymen. All unions provide lessons for a more extensive development of the elementary branches, together with commercial book-keeping. Some give instructions in stenography, English, and French. Some of the larger unions, such as those of Cologne and Düsseldorf, have special trade-courses provided for their members. 14 unions had special courses in sociology during the year.

34 unions have their own houses (Cologne and Düsseldorf two each) in which 1400 journeymen find board and lodging and 10,242 travelling journeymen were taken care of gratis. 35 unions have mutual sick insurance, which, during the year, paid 16,249 marks in sick benefits. 43 unions have their own savings institutions with deposits amounting to 749,857 marks, of which 308,806 were made during the past year. 20 unions have well regulated labor bureaus, which procured 4,984 journeymen profitable employment.

Each union also has its own library. At Cologne, Mülheim a. Rh., and Bonn, the unions have a special fund to aid financially former members who have started in business for themselves. The amount of business transacted last year by these institutions amounted to 2,000,000 marks. Three other unions assist their members during the time of military service, several defray funeral expenses. Cologne, besides its two assembly-halls, has two houses for married journeymen, in which twenty families find a cheap and very sanitary lodging.

Thus the Kolping institutes of the Archdiocese of Cologne set a beautiful example of Catholic social activity. Too few are these institutes in the U. S. Yet the social need of just such institutes, not only for journeymen, but for Catholic workmen generally, is perhaps greater among us than in Germany. They are the very institutes recommended by Leo XIII. and more than once advocated by THE REVIEW.

## LITERATURE.

*La Nouvelle France*, of Québec, begins, in its No. 8 (Aug. 1902), the publication of some "pages inédites" of Ernest Hello, contributed by the Abbé A. Damours, who was permitted to copy them from MSS. in possession of Hello's widow. We are glad to learn from M. Damours' letter of introduction that Hello is widely appreciated in Canada. Here in the United States only a few select minds know and love him.

# MISCELLANY.

**The Decline of the Religious Press.**—Speaking of the change of editorship in the *Observer*, the N. Y. *Sun* recently (June 29th) remarked:

"The decline of religious faith, or of religious partisanship, together with the increasing preference of the religious public for so-called secular papers, has drained very much of the life out of them (the specifically religious journals). In the old days the *Observer* had two distinct departments, 'Religious' and 'Secular,' and so arranged that the paper could be sharply divided for Sunday and for week-day reading, respectively. In the one, the world to come was the theme, in the other, this world of fact and sense and self-seeking. In the search after lost prosperity several formerly religious newspapers, the *Independent* and the *Outlook*, for example, have cast off religion as a distinguishing feature and have become substantially 'secular,' with the little of religion they contain very much diluted and sugared to suit the more sceptical or purely æsthetic taste of this time. Generally, the appearance of the papers which still seek to justify their title as religious is not now suggestive of material prosperity.....Nor does there remain to them more than a shadow of the powerful influence they once wielded in their churches."

The *Sun* refers to the Protestant religious press in particular, but its remarks are general and apply to the Catholic as well. The Catholic religious newspapers have never been very prosperous materially, but there was a time when they wielded a powerful influence both within the Church and outside of it. We need only recall the names of Brownson and McMaster. There is not a single Catholic periodical published in the United States to-day that could compare in standing and influence with either the former's *Review* or the latter's *Freeman's Journal*. The secular press has widely taken the place of the religious journals in our Catholic homes, and the quality of religion is degenerating correspondingly.

**The Reason Why.**—"Somebody wants to know," says the *Southern Messenger*, "why it is that every city in this country can produce its quota of intelligent Protestants converted to the Catholic Church, whereas no place can show an array of well-instructed Catholics gone over to Protestantism? The answer is very simple. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is so lucid that no intelligent mind can refuse it acknowledgment. There will be as many converts as there are honest inquirers after the truth. As a rule, ignorant or unintelligent Protestants are not among the converts. On the other hand, you will not find any intelligent Catholic becoming a Protestant, because Protestantism conflicts with human reason. Catholics may, and often do, lose their faith, the gift of God, in punishment of their sins, but they prefer even infidelity to Protestantism. Protestantism can not gain anything by attracting the ignorant, the indifferent, or the vicious element from the Catholic Church."

Why the *Sacred Heart Review* (of June 28th) reprints this religious balderdash is not easy to see. It ought to know a better

reason,—a reason given by the Savior Himself, when He said: "No one can come to me unless the Father draw him." (John vi, 44.)

Surely, the Father will draw no one to Protestantism. Neither does human intelligence play any important rôle. The Scribes and Pharisees were no dunces, yet but few of them embraced the doctrine of Jesus, the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

**Need For a New Honorary College Degree.**—The *Springfield Republican* clamors for some other and more adaptable product in the degree line than the LL. D., which is so often used in misapplication, because no proper substitute for it exists. No end of men are made doctors of laws who could not teach law, either in a practical or honorary way, let alone both the civil and canon law, as was the original requirement and function.

What is needed is the degree of doctor of achievement, not exactly a mantle of charity, but a hood and gown that can be put upon men who do things, achieve distinction and large results in lines of effort other than philosophy, theology, law, music, literature, and the humanities. The doctorate of achievement would cover the accumulative accomplishment, and so provide a place for benefactors upon whom other degrees would rest with humiliating awkwardness. Here is not the least of the arguments in its favor, let it be said, when every college in the land confesses that its greatest need is money.

**Has a Father a Right to Bequeathe an Inheritance to his Children and Grandchildren on Condition that they Marry and Raise their Offspring within the Church?**—The Supreme Court of Canada, *in re* Renaud vs. Lamothe, upholds the validity of such a stipulation. First because the Catholic Church is legally recognized in Canada, not as the State Church, but as an institution that may freely exercise its tenets, that may legally gather tithes, and, for the purpose of building churches, has a legally recognized right to place mortgages on the property of the parishioners, a privilege that no other religious body enjoys in any part of the British Empire.

Nor are such bequests against public order, because there is no law in all England or the Dominion forbidding them. What is adduced from the jurisprudence of France does not apply to the French law in Canada, since the new French law dates from 1789, whilst what is French law in Canada is the old French law, that agrees with the English law concerning the liberty of testating "without reserve, restriction, or limitation."

Nay more; by the Canadian law of 1801 even bastardy was no hindrance to be a divisee; much less, therefore, could a condition such as here referred to, be an obstacle to the validity of a will. The Supreme Court unanimously confirmed the judgment of the lower courts and condemned appellant to defray the costs. (*Vide*, *La Semaine Religieuse de Montréal*, of June 9th.)

# NOTE-BOOK.

After conducting the *New World*, "the official paper of the Province of Chicago," for eight and a half years with commendable zeal and such "prudence" as is essential in editing official organs, Mr. William Dillon has resigned the editorship and his resignation has been accepted by the Board of Directors. His successor is the Rev. Eneas B. Goodwin, who is said to be scholarly and very clever. As we have not read his occasional contributions hitherto published in the *New World*, we are unable to say whether he will bear out the promises of his admirers. At best, the editing of an organ is a thankless task, especially if said organ is owned by a stock company and managed by a board of directors, as the *New World* is. We think it is this experience rather than his "growing law practice," which moved Mr. Dillon, like his predecessor Mr. Hyde, to resign, and which will in all probability move the Rev. Mr. Goodwin to resign before a twelvemonth is over.

We should like to see a statistical account of the results in some of our large city parishes, of the practice of making young boys take the pledge at their confirmation. How many of the boys, approximately, keep this pledge? Is it true that the great majority of them do, and that the practice thus proves a blessing? Or are those right who allege that of these pledges, made at an age when the boys scarcely realize what they do, and made, moreover, under the stress of moral compulsion, few, very few are kept, and that the practice, being little more than a farce, ought to be discontinued?

Can any of our readers throw light on the subject?

Magistrate Dooley the other day sent Margaret Bernette to jail for ten days because she disturbed mass in St. Paul's Church, Brooklyn, on a Sunday morning, by stretching herself out in a pew and going to sleep.

"The Herodian government of France is tearing the infants of the people from the arms of their mothers, in order to sacrifice them to the exigencies of a cruel State; but the French Rachel does more than lament her little ones; she is fighting for them. We must not be carried off our feet with excitement over this sudden outburst of Herodianism in France." Thus the *Western Watchman*, Aug. 7th.

A certain portion of the Catholic element, which, we believe, is especially well represented in the *Watchman's* clientele, will never be carried off its feet because the infants of the people are torn from the arms of their mothers. More than one-fourth of the Catholic parishes of St. Louis have no Catholic schools. They graciously hand over their offspring to the State-school moloch. Ancient Herodianism sent the Holy Innocents straight up to Para-

dise; what we might call modern Herodianism, as practised especially in this country, needs a new name that will carry the perpetrators off their feet to knock some sense of duty into their heads.

The Chicago *New World*, in its account of the seventeenth convention of the American St. Caecilia Society, blandly queries (No. 49):

"How is it that in a small church like St. Mathias', located in a distant suburb (Bowmanville), we can hear the Gregorian chant sung in perfection, whereas in prominent churches of the large cities, where there are supposedly thoroughly equipped church musicians on the organ bench, we hear such murderous assaults on the spirit of plain chant and liturgy?"

The sorry condition of church music in most of our parishes, large and small, is due to ignorance and a lack of good will and the spirit of sacrifice; but mostly to ignorance.

The question of establishing a Catholic daily newspaper was brought before the Chicago convention of the American Federation of Catholic Societies, and though the Federation, being itself still "too young and too weak," refused to take the steps suggested by the enthusiastic advocates of the plan, much sympathy was expressed, and Father M. Arnoldi is out with a second appeal, urging well-to-do Catholics to interest themselves financially in the proposed undertaking. The first Catholic daily, if the plans of its promoters do not miscarry, is to be published somewhere east of the Mississippi River (probably in Chicago) by a stock company, with shares at fifty dollars each.

If any further proof of the anti-Catholic tendencies of the present administration of the Philippine Islands were required, it is furnished by the reported forming of a new "creed" in opposition to the Catholic Church, with Governor Taft, Dr. Tavera, and Aguinaldo as "honorary" presidents of the organization and an excommunicated priest as "bishop"!!!

It is expected that Mr. Taft will decline the unsolicited "honor." This does not alter the fact, however, that some of the founders of the new movement are men who are in the pay of the U. S., who made the most noise regarding the reputation of the friars, and who are undoubtedly under the impression that their new "creed" will find favor in the eyes of the "powers that be" and will certainly advance the temporal interests of the people actively engaged in spreading the trouble, no matter what their fate in the hereafter may be.

What a fine illustration to Archbishop Ireland's recent remarks!

The real underlying motive of the anti-friar campaign is thus accurately described by Rev. Dr. Lambert:

The attempt to make friar synonymous with everything depraved in human nature aims at something more than discredit-

ing the members of the religious orders against which it is directed. The Catholic Church is the real objective point of attack. It is a repetition of the tactics which were adopted against the Jesuits when they fronted the so-called Protestant Reformation and stayed it in its full career of success in the northern countries of Europe. The enemies of the Church never forgave these soldiers of the cross for the decisive victories they won on that occasion. By spreading the most outrageous lies about the Jesuits they have imbued the Protestant mind with the belief that the sons of St. Ignatius are a species of social outlaws.

History repeats itself. After three hundred years the same methods are employed to lessen the moral influence of the friars that were resorted to in the case of the Jesuits. In the twentieth, as in the seventeenth century, it is hatred of the Catholic Church which prompts the malignant and unscrupulous attacks upon those who spend their lives in her service.

Rev. Joseph A. Thie writes to THE REVIEW:

Not long ago Father Henry G. Ganss defended Mr. Pratt and the Indian school at Carlisle, Pa., and lately he again posed as the champion of the administration at the Chicago federation convention.

Three weeks ago I spoke to Mother Catherine, superior of the Indian school at Odanah, Wis., and she complained most bitterly that every one of their Indian children who had attended Carlisle, returned as a perfect and irrevocable infidel. She said that the students there are compelled to attend three or four lectures on religion every week, and of these lectures the Indian students say that in all things the different denominations disagree, except in one, i. e., that the Catholic belief is all wrong. In every lecture one or the other point of Catholic doctrine is ridiculed, so that on the whole the impression is made that the Catholic Church is a society of knaves and fools.

What the gift of faith meant to that eminent convert, C. Kegan Paul, recently deceased, may be inferred from the following quotation from his Reminiscences:

"Sorrows have come to me in abundance since God gave me grace to enter His Church, but I can bear them better than of old, and the blessing He has given me outweighs them all. May He forgive me that I so long resisted Him and lead those I love unto the fair land wherein He has brought me to dwell! It will be said, and said with truth, that I am very confident. My experience is like that of the blind man in the Gospel, who also was sure. He was still ignorant of much, nor could he fully explain how Jesus opened his eyes, but then he could say with unfaltering certainty: One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see.

Such familiar English words as Keep, Kidney, and Kill, we note, baffle even the learned etymologists of the Oxford Dictionary.